Arusianus Messius

(fl. c. 395)

BRIEFING

Arusianus Messius, or Messus (fl. 395), Latin grammarian, flourished in the 4th century.

LIFE

He was the author of a small extant work *Exempla Elocutionum*, dedicated to Olybrius and Probinus, consuls for the year 395. It contains an alphabetical list, chiefly of verbs admitting more than one construction, with examples from each of four writers, Virgil, Sallust, Terence and Cicero.

Cassiodorus, the only writer who mentions Arusianus, refers to his work *Exempla Elocutionum* by the term *Quadriga*.

CITATIONS FROM SALLUST'S *HISTORIES* IN ARUSIANUS MESSIUS

By C. M. MacDonald

FROM the method followed by Verrius Flaccus and Nonius Marcellus in the arrangement of their citations from Latin authors, it has been found possible to infer that this or that citation from a lost work followed or preceded in that work this or that other citation. For example, we now know that in the third book of Sisenna's Histories the fragment numbered 14 in Peter's edition really stood later in the book than the fragment numbered 33 by Peter; also that in the fourth book Peter's frag. 81 came after frag. 83 and before frag. 82. Did Arusianus Messius follow any discoverable method of arranging his ' Exempla Elocutionum,' which would enable us to infer the true position of this or that citation in the lost Histories of Sallust or the lost speeches of Cicero? Arusianus Messius, who lived at the end of the fourth century, derived his examples of Latin constructions (exempla elocutionum) from four authors, Virgil, Sallust, Terence, and Cicero. His book (sometimes called the ' quadriga Messi ') is arranged in alphabetic sections, an A-section, a B-section, a C-section, and so on, but within the sections themselves alphabetic order is not followed. It begins, for example, in this way :—

Abundans	Illus rei, Virg. Ecl. ii. 20.
	illa re, Cic. Pro Cornelio ii.
(abundat)	Illa re, Cic. Pro Cluentio 184.
(abunde est)	huius rei, Virg. Aen. Vii. 552.
Ardet	Illa re, Virg. Aen. xi. 782.
	illam rem, Virg. Ecl. ii. 1.
	in illa re, Sall. Cat. 5, 4.
	in illam rem, Virg. Aen. Vii. 623.

Then follow :—Avertit, Accingo, Appulit, Avidus, Abnuo, Amicus, Adhibet, etc. From the order of the citations under Abundans and Ardet it will be seen that Arusianus does not follow so transparent an arrangement as Nonius. His arrange- ment of the citations under each lemma seems to be at hap-hazard. At least I can find no tangible clue. He follows no definite order of the cases. Constructions with the Gen. precede constructions with the Abl. almost as often as they follow them. It is true that in the majority of instances a construction with a simple Case precedes a construction with a Preposition and a Case (as in the lemma Ardet, above), but since this rule is violated in about 28 and observed in about 75 instances, the number of the exceptions is too great to permit us to regard this clue as of much value. There is indeed one clue that seems more reliable. In those instances in which we find more than one example of exactly the same construction,- the second (or third) example follows the natural order, e.g. (p. 463 Keil, vol. vii. s. 1. Dignus):—

Dignus fieri	Virg. Ecl. v. 54, et puer ipse fuit cantari dignus ;
	Virg. Ecl. v. 85, et erat tum dignus amari ;

Or again (p. 479 Keil, s. l. Indutus) :—

Indutus ilis rebus	Virg. Aen. xi. 83, indutosque iubet truncos hostilibus armis ;
	Virg. Aen. xii. 947, tune etiam spoliis indute meorum ?

However, against 33 instances of this rule stand some 8 exceptions, which (unless they can fairly be referred to some scribe's error of transposition) destroy the infalli- bility of the clue. To one rule only, so far as I can see, there is no exception whatever. "When two examples of exactly the same construction are drawn from the same book of the same author, they are quoted in the natural order of sequence (as in the lemma Dignus, above). * Using this clue we can locate, relatively to each other, two passages in the second book of Sallust's Histories; also two passages in the fourth. We find under the lemma Suetus (p. 510 K.) :—

Suetus his rebus	Sall. Hist. ii (fr. 88 Maur.) genus militum suetum a pueritia latrociniis ; Sall. Hist. ii (fr. 85 Maur.) genus hominum vagum et rapinis suetum magis quam agrorum cultibus ;

And under the lemma In Praesentia (p. 487, K.) :—

In praesens	Sall. Hist. Iv (frag. 50 Maur.) quod in praesens modo satis cautum fuerat ; Sall. Hist. Iv (fr. 69, 19 Maur.) quid ab illis nisi dolum in praesens et postea bellum exspectans ?

We may therefore infer that in the text of Sallust Hist, ii the fragment numbered 88 by Maurenbrecher held some place prior to the fragment numbered 85, and similarly in the text of Book iv. fragment 50 M stood earlier than fragment 69 M.

NOTES ON THE *SILVAE* OF STATIUS

By C. M. MacDonald

In lecturing on some of the Silvern this winter, I have found that I sometimes arrived at a more or less decided opinion in favour of one reading or interpretation and against another. Much has been done for Statius of late, and the disputable passages are fewer than they were. It is in the hope of helping to make them fewer still that I venture to send these notes to the Classical Review. I have used the elaborate edition of Dr. Vollmer with increasing dis- trust : it seems to me a very unsafe guide. Sometimes Dr. Vollmer admits with good reason a reading that is not in the MSS {e.g. oertent in I. iv. 13 and carpsi, for carpsit, ib. 105 seem certain or all but certain) : sometimes he keeps the reading of the MSS when it is impossible (quis caneris, I. iv. 23) or ludicrous (hones, V. iii. 99). 'Quis caneris' has been condemned by Mr. Hous- man in his Prolegomena to Manilius (p. xlviii) and Mr. Housman with equal justice rejects Dr. Vollmer's interpretation of I. iv. 40 (a passage which I touch upon below, partly to discuss the use of ' ignarus').